

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)
	09/454,737	PERRICAUDET ET AL.
	Examiner David Guzo	Art Unit 1636

All Participants:

Status of Application: Amended

(1) David Guzo

(3) _____

(2) Katherine M. Kowalchyk

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 9/17/03, 9/19/03

Time: 3:00

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Potential rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph

Claims discussed:

15 and 19

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called applicants' representative on 9/17/03 to request approval to make an examiners amendment to claim 15. The amendment involves deletion of the phrase "a promoter selected from" because this Markush language is not appropriate given the amendment of claim 15 to delete all but one member of the Markush group. Applicants' representative indicated that she would need to get applicants' approval for the change and would get back to me. 9/19/03 Applicants' representative called to indicate that a definitive answer was not yet forthcoming from applicants and she would call back on Monday (9/22/03). She also indicated that claim 19 would need to be amended since it refers to the method of claim 15, not the composition of claim 15.